



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #0969TX-1 for Beaumont Independent School District

### A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	3
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has a clear rationale for wanting to develop personalized 1:1 learning (enhanced by feedback from the various stakeholder groups), but lacks a comprehensive or coherent vision for implementation or sustainability.</p> <p>Several weaknesses are noted, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students are identified as the last group of stakeholders, which contradicts the stated goal of improving learning for students.</li> <li>Applicant envisions RTT-D funds as a "cushion," as opposed to a catalyst for making real and lasting change.</li> <li>There is a greater focus on changing instruction, as opposed to improving student learning and achievement</li> </ul> <p>While not directly related to the score, the application is repetitive, sentences are replicated almost verbatim in multiple places, and it is unclear which pieces were already done or are in process and which pieces will be done during the grant period. Due to this, it is difficult to draw a clear vision from the narrative.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	7
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>a) This is a district-wide initiative and all schools are listed as participants. It is unclear if the district completed any type of readiness assessment to determine each school's starting point. There is no discussion as to why this is a district-wide initiative, as opposed to serving a subset of students or schools.</p> <p>b) The list of schools is provided.</p> <p>c) The total number of students is provided, including a subset of students identified as high-need students. All educators will participate.</p> <p>For the overall grant proposal, implementation steps only address one school (listed as a pilot), but it is unclear how the rest of the schools will be incorporated into the initiative.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	2
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant initially states that the model being implemented at one school will be scaled to the rest of the district, but there is very little detail on how that process will occur, what is currently being done at the pilot school, or if there is any evidence of success of the pilot model.</p> <p>There is no theory of change or logic model and the applicant does not cite any of the pieces of a high-quality plan.</p>		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	1
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant states that they plan to address each of the five specified areas, but no specific goals are stated for any of the areas.</p> <p>As required, goals are not provided in the narrative or in any tables.</p>		

As required, subgroup data is not provided.

## B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	1
(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The applicant states that policies and technological limitations have constrained such personalized and technology-based teaching in the past, but does not elaborate on what those policies are/were, or why they were not changed at the district level. The applicant acknowledges a history of poor student engagement in learning, but does not provide evidence of attempts to adjust instruction to better meet the needs of students, therefore the criteria are not directly addressed.</p> <p>(a) The application includes a list of various national and state awards for achievement. Some student performance statistics are provided, which indicate strong performance by subgroups, but it is unclear which tests the data represent, which year the data is from, or the "n" size of the subgroups. In effect, while achievement gaps are minimal and the percentages are high, the data does not demonstrate a clear record of success at improving student learning outcomes or closing achievement gaps, therefore the criteria was not addressed.</p> <p>(b) The application does not include any information on the district's history of successfully reforming persistently low-achieving schools, therefore the criteria was not addressed.</p> <p>(c) While students, parents and educators will have access to the e-portfolio system, the application does not specify the types or availability of data to students, educators, or parents, or how it would be used to inform and improve participation, instruction and services. It is unclear if the district has made any of this data available to stakeholders in the past and the criteria are not directly addressed.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	5
(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The applicant states that all four areas of information are available to the public.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	8
(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>As required, the SEA provides LEAs sufficient levels of autonomy to implement personalized learning environments, supported by state legal, statutory and regulatory requirements. Although this autonomy is provided, no examples of the LEA utilizing this autonomy in the past to implement successful conditions are provided.</p>		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	6
(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>a) The applicant held a variety of stakeholder focus groups to gather information and support for the proposal. It seems the needs and feedback of the focus groups were incorporated into the proposal. The student focus group was particularly fruitful, as the applicant realized that students were differentiating their own learning with technology, outside of school.</p> <p>Strong engagement with community groups (i.e. the Housing Authority) was also sought and received.</p> <p>It is not clear if the LEA has collective bargaining or not, and if the teachers clearly support the program. While the applicant cites teacher support, there is insufficient evidence of support from the collective bargaining unit or from 70% of teachers.</p>		

(b) The application includes a broad range of letters of support from key stakeholders, which indicate their involvement in the proposal's creation and their support for the plan.

This section is partially weak due to the lack of information regarding teacher support.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)

5

2

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant proposes a number of steps to increase technology in the schools, but it is unclear if a gap/needs assessment was completed or by whom. The district is in the process of re-evaluating some IT features, but it is unclear if it is connected to this grant or to other needs.

Some deliverables and tasks are provided, including updates on implementation in the pilot school, but lack detail, timelines, rationale, and persons responsible. In effect, a high-quality plan does not exist.

## C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	12
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(a) (b) The applicant proposes several strong programs and/or practices, but does not fully align the programs/practices to each other, nor are they fully described. Several aspects of the required criteria are missing or incomplete and are noted below.</p> <p>The applicant clearly recognizes the information students need to be college-ready and to apply to college, but it is unclear how the LEA proposes to teach that information to the students.</p> <p>There is a strong focus on college-ready, but limited information on alternative career pathways.</p> <p>Remote educational programs will be available to students, but it is unclear what courses will be provided, how students will find out about them, or how they connect to their school schedule or transcript.</p> <p>The applicant proposes a strong e-portfolio program to allow students, educators and parents access to plan and view data and academic/career goals. Students would also have access to a community member who would act as an e-mentor.</p> <p>A variety of other programs (ACT, et al) will be used to provide additional learning and enrichment opportunities for students. The Mobile Learning Institute at the Smithsonian is cited as a program option and seems to provide strong opportunities for students to work collaboratively, with technology, and in their own areas of interest.</p> <p>The applicant recognizes the goal of students assuming responsibility for their learning and thinking deeper through the 1:1 personalized learning experiences, but does not describe how to actually reach these goals.</p> <p>The applicant states that parents will have access to data. A parent involvement coordinator will be tasked with ensuring that parents know how to access that data and how to use it.</p> <p>A personalized learning sequence is desired for each student, but it is unclear what such a plan would look like and which programs and supports it would include.</p> <p>The applicant proposes to include a variety of life learning workshops as well, which will assist in the transition to college and career.</p> <p>There is no discussion on plans to support high-need or off-track students.</p> <p>(c) It is unclear if the applicant proposes specific training or supports to ensure that students understand how to use the tools and resources.</p>		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	13

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

(a) (b) Individually, the IMS and the e-portfolio systems offer a variety of planning, analysis, and monitoring tools for many groups of stakeholders. It is unclear how the IMS and the e-portfolio system are able to align and integrate with each other. If integration is not feasible, teachers will need to learn two new systems and figure out how to compare reports and data on their own.

It is still unclear how educators will work with students to develop their personalized learning environments, and how educators will use the various tools and programs to differentiate learning for students.

The applicant highlights the need to ensure PD is evaluated and effective, but neglects to state how PD needs will be determined, who will provide the PD, and how it will be provided (i.e. additional days for trainings/workshops, embedded in instruction, etc).

The applicant states that students and their teachers will be able to participate in The Mobile Institute program, but does not address how lessons learned at the summer camps/workshops would be brought back to the rest of the community.

The applicant cites the use of formative and summative assessments, but does not discuss what those assessments look like, how they're developed, how often they're given, or how the results are used to inform instruction.

(c) The applicant is in the process of developing a teacher and principal evaluation system that will reflect student learning. The applicant proposes to modify the pilot models (from the SEA's school improvement grant program) for the schools that will be part of this grant, which is an efficient use of resources and capacity.

The applicant includes a variety of pathways to monitor implementation and evaluate the progress of the program. Such forums include leadership meetings, employee roundtables, students roundtables, quarterly reports, etc.

A variety of performance bonuses and incentive plans are proposed to increase teacher/staff morale, reward improvements, and develop professional learning communities.

(d) The applicant proposes to utilize higher education partnerships to develop the existing staff, as well as to develop stronger pre-service teacher programs. Trainings for pre-service teachers will include some of the instructional techniques and methods students will use. The applicant acknowledges the lack of well-trained new teachers and has created a strong plan to develop better-trained new teachers. The applicant proposes PD opportunities for paraprofessionals as well. The applicant presents a "Grow your Own" STEM training program for current students. While a great idea that may impact long-term goals, it does not address current STEM needs.

Despite this strong vision, the applicant does not include a high-quality plan, i.e. one that is ready for implementation, to increase the number of effective and highly-effective teachers in the short-term.

The applicant proposes to use the SEAs Turnaround Leader Program to develop stronger principals, but it is unclear how that program will be implemented, if the SEA supports the idea, or which schools those principals will then lead.

Improving teaching quality at hard-to-staff schools is not addressed.

## D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	4

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does not propose sufficient structures, systems, or policies that would support the initiative. The individual criteria are discussed below:

a) The applicant discusses some communication strategies and structures that will be used to implement the program, but it is unclear who is doing which pieces of work, how the various schools and staff will communicate with each other, etc. The superintendent is involved in the program and will work with the school board to ensure implementation and consistent messaging. Several additional staff are recommended for hiring, but mostly in relation to the pilot at one school. A broader organizational structure is not provided.

The applicant addresses the need to change some district-controlled policies regarding access to internet content and safety.

(b) Ensuring that leadership teams have autonomy and flexibility is not discussed, nor are any potential changes that would require such flexibility.

- (c) "Giving students the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery, not the amount of time spent on a topic" is not addressed.
- (d) "Giving students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways" is not addressed.
- (e) "Providing learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and fully accessible to all students, including students with disabilities and English learners" is not addressed.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)

10

6

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant partially addresses each of the criteria. The recognition of the need for each of the criteria is stated, but lacks detail or a plan for implementation.

(a) The applicant frequently cites a Bring Your Own Device policy with regards to computers and laptops. It is recognized that some students may not have access to some technology, but it is unclear how the LEA plans to assess the need and provide appropriate resources to students in need. There is no discussion related to out of school supports or access, with the exception of the support of a local housing authority. Yet, what those supports look like is not described.

(b) The applicant acknowledges the need to support educators through this program and plans to hire additional support personnel. It is clear that the current IT support structures will not be sufficient. It is unclear if these support staff will assist students and parents, in addition to educators.

(c) The e-portfolio system will be accessible to students, but it is unclear what parts of the system parents will have access to, and if they will have the ability to export the information for other programs or purposes.

(d) The applicant discusses an information system for educator information and tracking assessments, but it is unclear how that system integrates with the e-portfolio, or other district systems.

## E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	9
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant states that evaluating the progress against milestones is necessary for the Web 2.0 initiative. A variety of "look fors" are cited, but more specific milestones, intermediate outcomes and goals are not cited and are "to be determined."</p> <p>The applicant acknowledges the need and desire to "proactively course correct," but does not include information on the process or structures that will do that monitoring and correcting.</p> <p>The applicant proposes to provide a variety of evaluative information on the progress and success of implementation to various stakeholders, but does not include a high-quality plan to do this.</p> <p>The applicant partially creates a continuous improvement process, but the details provided are insufficient.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant understands that ongoing messaging and proactive communication will be necessary during implementation. The school board is aware of the proposal and plan.</p> <p>The applicant acknowledges that parents will need additional supports to access and understand data, and plans to use a variety of technology pathways to address those needs and questions in a timely manner.</p> <p>The applicant discusses the need for everyone to "be on the same page" while communicating with stakeholders, but it is unclear which steps were taken as part of the proposal development and which steps are planned for ongoing communication and engagement.</p> <p>The applicant will require individual sites to submit Quarterly Implementation Reports to the LEA. The district will use these</p>		

reports to monitor site-based progress and address any issues.

The various pieces of a high-quality plan are not addressed relating to the ongoing communication and engagement.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)

5

1

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant states that each strategic initiative will have objectives and goals, but neglects to provide any specific objectives or goals for the pilot program, or the broader initiative.

The performance measures for highly effective teachers and principals seem reasonable.

The application does not include performance measures for any subgroups (including the target group of low-income students), nor are the goals school-specific. Only measures for "all participating students" are included. The baseline year is not cited, so it is difficult to evaluate the goals against the current performance.

The various performance measure charts include multiple measures within each cell, making it difficult to deduce which goal each percentage corresponds to. As a result of this, the applicant does not include 12 to 14 specific performance measures.

The performance measures provided show 100% implementation of various measures in year 1, yet the proposal indicates that implementation will start in one school and will then scale up to the other schools. The measures should reflect this scale up.

Also, many of the measures show implementation at 100% after year 1, which is ambitious, but not likely feasible.

Sub-criteria b and c are not addressed.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)

5

2

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant proposes a variety of ways to assess the progress and the success of the program, yet detail on the evaluation process, areas of focus to assess, and benchmark goals are not addressed.

## F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	1
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>a) The applicant includes other sources of funding in the budget (\$6.9M), but does not specifically state which year they will be provided, or which aspects they will support.</p> <p>The application does not include budgets broken down by project.</p> <p>b) The budget requests similar amounts of funds for each year and does not reflect a well-thought out implementation plan or changing needs over the course of the grant period. Some budget categories and amounts vary over the four years, but there is no rationale to back up those variances.</p> <p>c) Appropriate rationale supports some of the expenses, particularly in relation to personnel.</p> <p>No specifics are provided on the types, numbers, or actual costs of equipment purchases needed (\$18M total). The same lack of justification is found in relation to supplies, travel, and other.</p> <p>There is no identification on one-time investments vs ongoing costs.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	2
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant lists a variety of state and federal funding pools that could be used to enhance and sustain this work. Cost savings are noted, but post-grant budgets are not provided, nor are plans for sustaining both the resources and capacity.</p> <p>A high-quality plan (including goals, measures, persons responsible, a timeline, and a post-grant budget) to address</p>		

sustainability is not provided.

The applicant hints at a desire for sustainability, but does not present an adequate plan for the sustainability of resources or systems/structures.

### Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	0
Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments: The applicant does not include a competitive preference priority.		

### Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Not Met
Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments: The applicant does not provide a coherent or comprehensive vision or plan to bring personalized learning environments to all participating students. The overall strategy is vague, and while some specific programs or practices may be strong and will likely improve teaching and learning (and the use of technology), the overall structure of the grant proposal is not sufficient, nor does it present innovative ways to ensure personalized learning environments for students.		

Total	210	88
-------	-----	----



## Race to the Top - District

### Technical Review Form

Application #0969TX-2 for Beaumont Independent School District

### A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	5
(A)(1) Reviewer Comments: The applicant has met the criteria for articulating a clear and coherent reform vision that builds on its work in four core education assurance areas in order to implement a personalized learning environment. However, the applicant's narrative lacks details in how each LEA involved in this proposal will benefit as a result of this specific approach to the goals .  The applicant has presented a vision for reform but it lacks a clear reform as it states that this reform will depend on the guidance by the leadership of the new superintendent.		

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The extent to which the applicant's approach to implementing its reform proposal will support high-quality LEA-level and school-level implementation of this proposal is reasonable and rational. The following strengths were in the proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All 19, 819 students, of which a total of 14,266 that have been identified as either low income or high-needs</li> <li>• All students will participate in this project</li> <li>• All teachers and administrators at the LEA's 29 schools will participate in the project. The applicant has deemed this a district-wide, inclusive initiative</li> <li>• This concerted collaboration ensures that all schools, students and teachers are participating in the proposed activities for this project.</li> </ul> <p>Overall, the applicant has provided evidence to demonstrate this proposal has a high-quality LEA level and school-level implementation.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	6
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant's narrative details its plan for LEA-wide reform and change by assuring that every student in the district will participate in this transformation, however, the narrative does not provide details on how the reform proposal will be scaled up.</p> <p>The lack of details to support the plan for change beyond the participating schools and the students who have not been identified as either low-income or high-needs, would determine the full impact of reform as a result of this proposal, and how this plan will be used to reach its outcome goals beyond the participating schools.</p> <p>Overall, the applicant has not provided a high-quality plan for LEA-wide reform and change.</p>		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	7
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant's LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes demonstrates are aligned to components of a personalized learning environments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The summative performance data is ambitious as it begins with 800 students and targets proficiency for all students (19K plus) post-grant</li> <li>• Targets all subgroups for decreasing achievement gaps</li> <li>• No documented evidence to support targets for graduation rates</li> <li>• Targets for college enrollments for all subgroups</li> </ul> <p>Overall, the reviewer cannot determine if the applicant's vision is likely to result in improved student learning and performance due to the lack of specific details to support the subgroups which have not been identified in this proposal. It would have been helpful to the reviewer if the applicant had provided the documentation to support this vision.</p>		

## B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	7
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant's narrative provides examples of evidence that demonstrate four years of success in advancing student achievement and increasing equity in learning and teaching. The success has been demonstrated on national and local levels. However, it would have increased the strength of the proposal if the following had been provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A description, chart or graph, as evidence that demonstrates the applicant's ability to:</li> </ul>		



Close achievement gaps by specifically identifying the achievement gaps to close (i.e.... student achievement, high school graduation rates, and college enrollment rates.

- A listing of the schools identified as lowest-achieving or low-performing in order to demonstrate the applicant's reform ability
- A narrative that included evidence to demonstrate a plan to make student performance data available to students, educators, and parents in ways that inform and improve participation, instruction and services.

Overall, the applicant's clear track record of success for the past four years has been insufficient. It would have been helpful to the reviewer if the applicant had provided documentation to demonstrate success with turning around low performing schools, and how data was provided to parents and students that improved and informed services.

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	5
--	---	---

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant addresses all four of the areas for LEA transparency. The narrative is descriptive in that it provides detailed:

- information is communicated for each of the categories specified in this criteria are obtainable by electronically, written or by request.
- all school personnel salaries are made available upon request
- non-personnel expenditures at the school level are made available .

Overall the applicant has demonstrated evidence of transparency.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	8
---	----	---

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The criteria for State context for implementation has been demonstrated by the applicant.

The applicant 's local governance extends autonomy under State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement the personalized learning environments described in the applicant's proposal.

- Remote Educational Program authority
- Broad flexibility to define competency based models
- Texas Bill 6 (SB 6) grants provisions for adopting and funding instructional materials, and technological equipment
- Texas Bill 6 grants school autonomy to purchase either textbooks or digital content and the technology for students to use digital content
- State allocated funding provided for materials

The applicant lacks details to describe the level of autonomy for each LEAs included in this proposal.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	5
---	----	---

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The narrative provides a description of how students, families, teachers and principals in participating schools were engaged in the development of the proposal, as appropriate and how the proposal was revised based on their engagement and feedback is satisfactory in meeting the criteria (B)(4). The applicant has provided letters support from several key stakeholders comprised of the business and institutions of higher education.

It would have been stronger if the applicant provided documents from principals in each of participating schools, collective bargaining representation or other evidence of direct support engagement and support for teachers, parents and parent organizations. Key stakeholders, such as principals, teachers, and parents are integral for any massive and innovative change , as outlined in this proposal.

The proposal is ambitious and involved many components that require complex collaborations between all key stakeholders, in order to facilitate this ambitious plan within an existing educational culture. It is important that the plan for change is communicated, shared and acknowledged by all key stakeholders.

Overall, the applicant has not provided evidence to demonstrate meaningful engagement with all key stakeholders who will be impacted by this proposal.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	3
<p>(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant plan is supported by the strategies that will be utilized in order to address identified needs and gaps for this innovative plan. The applicant acknowledges the plan is of a complex strategy and is going to initially be a pilot at one of the district 's school. The proposal would lacked details on how the reliability and availability of a network system is able to fully support the technological demands embedded in this plan. The applicant has begun to analyze the needs required for this type of network demand, as well as the the current networking gaps. As a result of this analysis the applicant has determined the core network infrastructure is currently sufficient to implement personalized learning environments.</p> <p>The plan offers little details as to the implementation of the plan and how this plan will identify gaps.</p> <p>Overall, the applicant has not presented a high-quality for implementing personalized learning environments. It would have been helpful to the reviewer if the applicant had provided additional support how this complex strategy impacts and addresses the needs and gaps of students.</p>		

### C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	10
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant's plan provides some details to support its approach toward college-and career-readiness and presents a strong plan ensuring the curriculum and instructional strategies are fundamentally sound:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strategic plan to incorporate various topics that include financially preparing for college,(i.e.. financial-aid planning for college) This demonstrates a holistic approach to college and career readiness, traditionally the focus is on academics</li> <li>• 21st century skills focus (e.g.. cultural sensitivity, collaboration with others, critical thinking, civic responsibility, etc.)</li> <li>• Utilizing learning maps and dashboards to deepen student learning experiences by providing skills trains that will necessary in order to be successful in college and the work world</li> <li>• Provides for multiple ways and opportunities to demonstrate mastery of standards by implementing data-based applications that provide access to digital learning content</li> <li>• Greater access to remote educational programs to provide students with access to approved rigorous online courses in other districts</li> <li>• Increased exposure to activities that promote STEM</li> <li>• The plan lacks documentation to support how students will be supported during implementation of personalized learning environments district-wide</li> <li>• The timeline and process for implementing the learning strategies could be more detailed</li> <li>• The application lacks details on how students with disabilities will supported during implementation of personalized learning environments</li> </ul> <p>Overall, the applicant has not sufficiently demonstrated evidence of a high-quality plan for improving learning and teaching in a personalized learning environment in order to provide students with supports to graduate college and career ready.</p>		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	20
<p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has a strong plan and it highlights the process to produce and sustain effective teaching and learning. The practices and programs is deeply rooted in teacher preparedness, and teachers must be provided with professional development that meets their needs, in order to create a personalized learning environments in order to provide all students with the supports to be college-and-career ready.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Train all teachers to evaluate their own performance using monitoring and feedback data</li> <li>• Support and provide opportunities in needed areas of support based on the data</li> <li>• Teacher/Principal evaluations will be used to determine teacher effectiveness</li> <li>• Implement district-wide incentive pay-plan for exemplary performance</li> <li>• Adapting content based on using dashboards to monitor student performance</li> <li>• Using a data system designed to give teachers greater access to student data in order to implement targeted and appropriate interventions in a timely manner</li> </ul>		

- Providing on-going professional development to all teachers is consistent with learning in the age of digital and personalized learning
- Student feedback and suggestions on effective teaching/learning strategies adds much needed relevancy on why systems need to change
- Recognizes the positive benefits from partnerships with higher institutions in order to develop highly trained teachers who have been identified as being effectively trained on how to implement the best strategies needed for high-needs students, will cut down on time students lose from learning as a result of being mismatched with a teacher who has not been properly trained to effectively meet their learning needs

#### D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	5
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant's plan discusses the rationale to justify organizational commitment and readiness for this project implementation, however, the applicant does not specifically address how the LEA practices , policies and rules impact student learning according to criteria (a) to (e)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It would have been stronger if the applicant had submitted support that specifically details how the LEA central office is organized and structured in order to provide support and services to all participating schools.</li> <li>• It would have been stronger if the applicant had submitted details how school leadership teams in participating schools will be given the sufficient flexibility and autonomy over factors such as schedules and calendars, school personnel decisions and staffing models, roles and responsibilities for educators and non-educators, and school level budgets.</li> <li>• It would have been stronger if the applicant had provided details for giving students the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery, not the amount of time spent on a topic and opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways</li> <li>• It would have been stronger if the applicant had provided details to in the narrative to support providing learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and fully accessible to all students including students with disabilities and English learners.</li> </ul> <p>Overall, the applicant has not satisfied the criteria for (D)(1). It failed to identify a plan that outlines specific success.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	3
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant details in this plan for the LEA and school infrastructure are vague and lack specificity with regard to the needs of students, parents, educators, or other stakeholders.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The application could have been strengthened by providing explicit details to inform how participating students, parents, educators, and other stakeholders, regardless of income, have access to necessary content, tools, and other learning resources both in and out of school to support the implementation of the applicant's proposal.</li> <li>• The application could have been strengthened by providing explicit details to inform how students, parents, educators, and other stakeholders (as appropriate and relevant to student learning) have appropriate levels of technical support, which may be provided through a range of strategies.</li> <li>• The application could have been strengthened by providing explicit details for using technology systems that allow parents and students to export their information in an open data format (as defined by this notice) and to use the data in other electronic learning systems.</li> <li>• The application could have been strengthened by providing explicit details to inform how LEAs and schools use interoperable data systems (as defined in this notice).</li> </ul> <p>Overall, the applicant did not present plan of high-quality to support project implementation.</p>		

#### E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

--	--	--

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	10
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has presented a plan which recognizes successes as well as gaps, and opportunities for improvements. The plan has a heavy reliance on implementing an improved data system that will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Employ a data system designed to measure and review evaluate achievement criteria - both positive and negative- that will be timely and efficient</li> <li>• A detailed system of measurement and review - that shows results, validates, directs, justifies, intervenes. This cycle of process is critical for continuous improvement</li> <li>• Creating measurement reports specific for each one of their stakeholders or groups. This level of filtering data is not uncommon, but it is important and critical when data distributed is relevant and purposeful to the recipient. It demonstrates and creates opportunities for engagement that results in meaningful feedback</li> <li>• Plan lacks specific details that address how the applicant will monitor and measure how the project goals will be publicly shared</li> </ul> <p>Overall, the applicant's plan lacks adequate details to fully support a continuous improvement process. It would have been helpful to the reviewer if the applicant has provided details that support how the key stakeholders (teachers, students, and parents) involved in this process will be given multiple opportunities for ongoing corrections and improvements.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	5
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant's strategies demonstrate their commitment to teaching and learning in the digital-age and meeting students where they are in this age of ever-emerging social networking, therefore employing methods of communication that are commonplace for today's generation of learners.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Utilizing social networks (e.g. Twitter) to disseminate information to internal and external stakeholders</li> <li>• Video conferencing (e.g. Skype)</li> <li>• Continue traditional methods of communication that engage not only engage internal stakeholders, but also external stakeholders with face-to-face meetings</li> <li>• Provide all stakeholders with training for awareness and understanding of digital citizenship and Responsible Use Guidelines</li> </ul> <p>Overall, the applicant has presented a plan of sufficient quality. While it uses various levels of technology and non--technology users, and the plan lacks appropriate strategies for how ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders will be disseminated.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	0
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The reviewer was unable to effectively evaluate Performance Measures methodology and/or rationale for calculating the measure. The applicant does not provide a high quality plan for performance measures because the data was insufficient. It would have been helpful if all the data was provided in order for the reviewer to determine if the project's performance measures for all students and grade-groups demonstrated evidence of ambitious yet achievable goals.</p> <p>Overall, the applicant does not provide evidence to support 12-14 performance measures to address ambitious yet achievable plan.</p>		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	0
<p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant's evaluation of the effectiveness of Race to the Top - District funded activities does not satisfy this criteria.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It would have strengthened the narrative if the applicant had provided details to support this criteria (E)(4). It would</li> </ul>		

have been helpful to the reviewer if the applicant's plan included details on what data the the updates will capture and how it will be used to impact RTT-D funded activities.

- It would have been helpful if the applicant had provided examples for the criteria that will be measured for ongoing improvement in order to evaluate the effectiveness of this plan
- Provide specific examples of the reports that are specific for each one of the stakeholder groups
- The applicant discusses measuring data and results but plan does not provide what measurement criteria that will be monitored and publicly shared

Overall, the applicant does not present a high quality plan for evaluating effectiveness of investments.

## F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	5
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant's budget identifies the fund that will support the project; and is reasonable and sufficient to support the development and implementation of the applicant's proposal; a thoughtful rationale is provided for investments and priorities supports criteria (F)(1)(a), (b), (c) (i).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The application could have been strengthened if details were provided in the budget narrative</li> <li>• Differentiation of funds could have clarified one-time investments</li> <li>• Specific strategies that will ensure the long-term sustainability of the personalized learning environments were not included</li> </ul> <p>Overall, the applicant has not provided documentation to fully support rationale for the proposal's budget.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	5
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The plan does not specifically provide details for for three years after the grant, however, the plan provides innovative yet ambitious ideas that support project sustainability after the term of the grant. There is no evidence to support the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revenue sources result from research based best practices uncovered through longitudinal data base to</li> <li>• Savings from reduction in computer leases</li> <li>• Variety of funding pools to sustain project</li> </ul> <p>Overall, the applicant has not provided documentation to demonstrate sustainability of project goals.</p>		

## Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	0
<p>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant does not provide documentation to support Competitive Preference Priority.</p>		

## Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Not Met
<p>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</p>		

The applicant has not adequately demonstrated its ability to meet Absolute Priority by providing documentation support and details to support:

- how they will create personalized learning environments that will broaden academic equity, and access in order to increase student engagement, improve teaching and learning through a process that addresses the needs of all students in the subgroups such as minority, special education.
- What additional input or influence will the teachers, students, community and civic based stakeholders in the development and district-wide implementation of this plan be taken into consideration during the implementation process and ongoing review process.
- Specific details in the plan to describe how the applicant plans to build on a demonstrated reforms such as STEM initiatives, increased access to technology, instructional strategies designed to meet the needs of students, alignment to college-and career-ready standards that increase student achievement in the core educational assurance areas in order to increase equity and student achievement for all students.

Overall, the applicant has not presented a plan that demonstrates all of the core educational assurances areas and provided the needed evidence in order to meet Absolute Priority 1.

Total	210	119
-------	-----	-----

### Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)

	Available	Score
Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)	15	0

Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments:

The reviewer did not find documents for an optional budget supplement.



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #0969TX-3 for Beaumont Independent School District

### A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	1

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant fails to articulate a comprehensive and coherent reform vision.

1. Applicant states that "Although BISD is already on the "race-track" to realizing our bold vision, district leadership needs support from Race to the Top funding in order to build on our work and expedite full realization of our vision— especially for the students, families, and other stakeholders that we serve."

Vision is ambiguous and confusing.

2. Applicant states that " Students' 1:1 personalized learning environments will be designed with adaptive curriculum, instructional improvement systems, collaborative and individual tasks, mobile learning tools, limited parent and community access, as well as virtual courses, classrooms, and programs— each student having an e-portfolio containing all pertinent data."

Vision lacks a clear, credible approach to achieving goals.

3. The vision fails to adequately address the four core educational assurance areas.

4. The vision focuses on frustration experienced by students, parents, educators, and principals. Frustration appears to be connected with the presence and/or absence of digital learning in the schools. Applicant loosely connects this frustration with lack of student engagement in the classroom by stating the following:

"It is important to note here that engagement is not about hardware, software or mobiles, it is about the instruction being delivered inside that classroom. What needs to change is HOW teachers are instructing in the classroom. The key to addressing student engagement is to philosophically change the way teachers are instructing in the classroom—move into the technology instruction paradigm shift with a sure commitment!"

The above vision statement lacks clarity.

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)

10

5

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant offers incomplete and unclear information about its implementation of its reform proposal.

(a) The Applicant selected all district schools to participate; however, details are not included to support that the participating schools meet the competition's eligibility requirements. Also, it is unclear if the program will be piloted in a single school during the first year of the grant. This is a district-wide, inclusive initiative.

(b) The Applicant includes a list of the schools that will participate in grant activities. It is unclear if the program will be piloted in a single school during the first year of the grant.

(c) The total number of participating students directly served by BISD's plan under Absolute Priority 1 is:

- 19,819 students from all campuses throughout the district will participate in the Race to the Top project.
- Participating students from low-income families: 11,124 students from low-income families will participate in the Race to the Top project.
- Participating students who are high-need students : 14,266 students who are high-need students will participate in the grant project.

Applicant included list of schools and data related to low-income students and high-need students; however, Applicant fails to describe how participating schools meet the competition's eligibility requirements. Additionally, Applicant does not identify characteristics that identify students as "high-needs" other than income.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)

10

0

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant fails to provide required information. Applicant does not include a high-quality plan. The submission does not adequately describe how the reform proposal will be translated into meaningful reform to support district-wide change and help the applicant reach its outcome goals. There is no information related to the Applicant's logic model or theory of change of how its plan will improve student learning outcomes for all students who would be served by the Applicant.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)

10

1

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant does not include data that directs and/or supports goals. however, Applicant does include goals for a, b, c, and d. Applicant does not address how the LEA goals will improve student outcomes.

## B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

Available

Score

(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	1
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The Applicant does not present a clear record of success in the past four years in advancing student learning and achievement and increasing equity in learning and teaching.</p> <p>(a) Applicant notes that Blue Ribbon awards were earned by three schools in the last three years. Also, highlights included are 2010-11 Academic Excellence Indicator System, 2011 Accountability Rating: Academically Acceptable, and Gold Performance Acknowledgments: Texas Success Initiative (TSI) Mathematics. Sixteen of the district's schools are rated among Texas' top 12% in academic achievement. More than half of the ratable schools in Beaumont ISD achieved the National Center for Educational Achievement's National Higher Performance Schools rating. Students, parents, and educators at three of BISD's campuses were among the Texas Honor Roll Schools: Homer Drive Elementary, Regina Howell Elementary, and Price Elementary—a National &amp; State Demonstration site.</p> <p>Applicant offers insufficient information related to past successes as well as standards and requirements for noted achievements and awards.</p> <p>(b) Applicant does not address its ability to achieve ambitious and significant reforms in its persistently lowest-achieving schools or in its low-performing schools.</p> <p>(c) Applicant does not address its ability to make student performance data available to students, educators, and parents in ways that inform and improve participation, instruction, and services.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	5
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant has a high degree of transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investment as required by Texas statute. All required information is posted on the state website.</p> <p>(a) Applicant provides required information.</p> <p>(b) Applicant provides required information.</p> <p>(c) Applicant provides required information.</p> <p>(d) Applicant provides required information.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	5
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant's provision of statutory evidence demonstrates its autonomy; however, its evidence does not adequately support that successful conditions exist in the school district that will enable it to implement the personalized learning environments described in the Applicant's proposal. Applicant provides insufficient information for full assessment of State context for implementation.</p>		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	5
<p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant's plan for stakeholder engagement and support has both strengths and weaknesses.</p> <p><u>Strengths:</u></p>		



Applicant provides descriptions of public meetings held to engage stakeholders.

Applicant includes twenty letters of support from varied stakeholders including the Beaumont Housing Authority, Lamar University, and the NAACP.

Weaknesses:

Applicant lacks information about stakeholder contributions to plan.

Applicant does not address the status of the LEA and collective bargaining representation.

Applicant omits needed information related to meaningful stakeholder engagement in the development of the proposal and its subsequent support.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)

5

1

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant does not offer a high-quality plan of its current status in implementing personalized learning environments and the logic behind the reform proposal contained within the applicant's proposal, including identified needs and gaps that the plan will address.

1. It is unclear if the plan will be first implemented as a pilot program in a single school and/or then placed in all district schools.
2. Application lacks clarity and specificity related to infrastructure and classroom configuration as evidenced by statement "BISD believes that some type of interactive smart boards is the projection solution."
3. Applicant's current status is in the evaluative process related to the present network architecture. Much of the focus of the plan is related to hardware and infrastructure as evidenced by the content addressing "network engineering," "data center," and "Web 2.0 integration."
4. Applicant inadequately identifies needs and gaps that the plan will address and connections offering little information related to the implementation of personalized learning environments as well as the logic behind the reform proposal contained within the plan. Frustration appears to "drive" the logic of the proposal.

## C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	4

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Although Applicant has strong intentions and ideas for improving student learning, the response lacks specificity, coherence, clarity, and cohesion to Absolute Priority I as well as the District Race to the Top goals. There is not a clear delineation between the proposal and the Applicant's included research and views of consultants.

(a) With the support of parents and educators, all students:

(i) Understand that what they are learning is key to their success in accomplishing their goals:

Applicant details plans that provide counseling and direction to students related to learning as key to their success in accomplishing their goals. District uses learning maps and interest inventories like the ACT Plan and ACT EXPLORE to offer student guidance and direction. It is not clear how this connects to the district plan.

(ii) Identify and pursue learning and development goals linked to college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice) or college- and career-ready graduation requirements, understand how to structure their learning to achieve their goals, and measure progress toward those goals:

Applicant notes the use of e-portfolios and interest assessments to encourage student goals to pursue learning and set goals

linked to college- and career-ready standards. Applicant notes the uses of learning maps and dashboards to help students to understand college- and career-ready graduation requirements and how to structure their learning to achieve their goals. The e-portfolio will be a tool to measure progress toward those goals.

(iii) Are able to be involved in deep learning experiences in areas of academic interest:

Applicant explains its 1:1 Personalized Learning program that will allow student choices to participate in courses. Applicant does not offer information about varied delivery modes; however, the Applicant does express that the district seeks to expand student choices.

(iv) Have access and exposure to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives that motivate and deepen individual student learning:

Applicant does not address students having access and exposure to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives that motivate and deepen individual student learning.

(v) Have access and exposure to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives that motivate and deepen individual student learning:

Applicant inadequately addresses student mastery of critical academic content. Applicant includes Applicant addresses student acquisition of traits such as goal-setting, teamwork, perseverance, critical thinking, communication, creativity, and problem-solving.

(b) With the support of parents and educators, there is a strategy to ensure that each student has access to:

(i) A personalized sequence of instructional content and skill development designed to enable the student to achieve his or her individual learning goals and ensure he or she can graduate on time and college- and career-ready:

Applicant will use the e-portfolio to assess, track, and prescribe a personalized sequence of instructional content and skill development designed to enable the student to achieve his or her individual learning goals and ensure he or she can graduate on time and college and career-ready. The adherence to statewide standards (Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills and College and Readiness Standards) is followed to graduate well-qualified students; however, the plan does not include the "how" and "why" to accomplish this goal.

(ii) A variety of high-quality instructional approaches and environments:

Applicant offers examples of high-quality instructional approaches and environments like digital learning programs including the Smithsonian Mobile Classroom as well as other remote educational programs; however the Applicant's plan lacks specificity about the utilization of these programs to accomplish student-related goals as required for Race to the Top District competition.

(iii) High-quality content, including digital learning content as appropriate, aligned with college and career-ready standards or college and career-ready graduation requirements:

Applicant is vague about the employment of high-quality learning content in the district; however, the Applicant does address its alignment with college- and career-ready standards.

(iv) Applicant does not address ongoing and regular feedback in plan.

(v) Applicant does not address accommodations and high-quality strategies for high-need students to help ensure that they are on track toward meeting college- and career-ready standards) or college and career-ready graduation requirements.

(c) Mechanisms are in place to provide training and support to students that will ensure that they understand how to use the tools and resources provided to them in order to track and manage their learning:

Applicant does not provide a plan for the mechanisms to provide training and support to students that will ensure that they understand how to use the tools and resources provided to them in order to track and manage their learning.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	8
<p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant's plan lacks clarity and specificity resulting in a low-medium quality response.</p> <p>The following examples support the analysis of this element:</p> <p>(a)</p> <p>(i) Applicant's plan is vague related to the effective implementation of personalized learning environments and strategies that meet each student's academic needs and help ensure all students can graduate on time and college- and career-ready. Applicant does reference the Mobile Learning Institute at the Smithsonian as a personalized learning environment for the district.</p> <p>(ii) Applicant's plan mentions collaborative learning as a student interest. The Applicant does not address the adaptation of content and instruction while providing opportunities for students to engage in common and individual tasks, in response to their academic needs, academic interests, and optimal learning approaches.</p> <p>(iii) Applicant will use item analysis, e-portfolios, and personal feedback to measure student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready standards. Applicant's plan proposes to better use data to inform both the acceleration of student progress and the improvement of the individual and collective practice of educators while collecting and connecting data with students/teachers. Application omits specific plans for data gathering, analysis, and dissemination.</p> <p>(iv) Applicant's plan provides for the creation and implementation of teacher and principal evaluation systems. Frequent feedback is included in the plan although the Applicant does not include specifics about evaluation content, creation process, or administration of evaluation system. Applicant does not address how the evaluation system will support and identify interventions as needed for improvement.</p> <p>(b) Applicant's plan calls for system-wide, regularly scheduled professional development for all educators.</p> <p>(c) Although Applicant's plan calls for system-wide, regularly scheduled professional development for all educators, Applicant does not provide sufficient evidence and details to understand the district's plan for needed training. The Applicant does not clearly address policies, tools, data, and resources including:</p> <p>(i) Information, from such sources as the district's teacher evaluation system that helps school leaders and school leadership teams assess, and take steps to improve, individual and collective educator effectiveness and school culture and climate, for the purpose of continuous school improvement; and</p> <p>(ii) Training, systems, and practices to continuously improve school progress toward the goals of increasing student performance and closing achievement gaps.</p> <p>(d) Due to the lack of clarity and specificity in the plan, the applicant does not have a high-quality plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals including in hard-to-staff schools, subjects (such as mathematics and science), and specialty areas (such as special education). Applicant is vague about special education and other special student populations.</p>		

#### D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	4
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant offers a response that is unclear and missing information . Below are details that support this evaluation:</p> <p>(a) Applicant describes a district office that will attempt to provide support and services to all participating schools; however, the Applicant recognizes that the cultural change that may occur through this project will have "many bumps in the road."</p> <p>Applicant fails to describe a convincing organizational plan that will result in a central office as a support for the Race to the</p>		

Top grant as follows:

- (b) This item is not clearly addressed by Applicant.
- (c) This item is not clearly addressed by Applicant.
- (d) This item is not clearly addressed by Applicant.
- (e) This item is not clearly addressed by Applicant.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)

10

2

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant does not offer a response. Elsewhere in application, Applicant does provide that Instructional Technologists in each school will offer support to students, parents, and educators.

## E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	4
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant presents a limited plan with limited strategies for implementing a rigorous continuous improvement process that provides timely, regular feedback on progress towards project goals. Applicant offers insufficient information about its opportunities for ongoing corrections and improvements during and after the term of the grant. Below are missing elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Applicant's plan lacks adequate details to comprehensively support a continuous improvement plan.</li> <li>• Applicant employs a data system; however, the measurement and evaluative components are unclear.</li> <li>• Applicant fails to explain its process for publicly sharing project goals.</li> </ul>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	2
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Response lacks adequate ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders and an approach to continuously improve Applicant's plan. Applicant does include limited methods for ongoing communication and engagement.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	1
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant provides limited information to explain how the Applicant will continuously improve plan.</p> <p>Applicant fails to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide complete, supporting data as required.</li> <li>2. Indicate thoughtful process in establishing target goals for performance measures. Each year has the same target goal. There is no beginning point, evidence of plan, continuum of progress, and final goal indicated in graphic or narrative representations.</li> <li>3. Provide information about subgroups.</li> <li>4. Offer high-quality descriptions.</li> </ol>		

## 5. Provide baseline data for performance measures.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)

5

0

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant did not submit response to this area.

## F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	2
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: Applicant's response provides inadequate budget information in both narrative and budget sections. Below are supporting details of this evaluation:  (a) Funds are identified in Budget Subpart graphs; however, there is limited budget narrative included with graphs. Also, the included narrative insufficiently identifies all funds that will support the project.  (b) Applicant does not provide sufficient description and explanation of funds to prove that the budget is reasonable and sufficient to support the development and implementation of its proposal.  (c) Applicant does not provide a thoughtful rationale for investments and priorities.  (i) Although funds are categorized in the Budget Subpart graphics, narrative is incomplete. Budget entries lack clarity. Allocation of funds for personnel lacks sufficient information to justify expenditures as they connect with Applicant's proposal.  (ii) Applicant does not include information that identifies funds that will be used for one-time investments versus those that will be used for ongoing operational costs that will be incurred during and after the grant period, as described in the proposed budget and budget narrative, with a focus on strategies that will ensure the long-term sustainability of the personalized learning environments.		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	2
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: Applicant does not offer convincing evidence that the project can or will be sustained after the end of the grant. Applicant does not provide a high-quality plan for sustainability of the project's goals after the term of the grant. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Applicant offers limited, specific information about sustainability of project goals.</li> <li>Applicant addresses general financial support post-grant; however, few specifics(sources/proposed or needed financial amounts) are included.</li> <li>Applicant asserts that 6.6 million dollars will be saved each year due to reduction in paper and printing costs associated with textbooks and other educational materials. Applicant provides no evidence that the saved funds will contribute towards sustainability of project post-grant.</li> </ul>		

## Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	0
Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments: Applicant did not submit a response.		

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Not Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

Although Applicant fails to coherently and comprehensively address Absolute Priority 1, the Applicant does offer a plan that includes personalized learning through acquisition of personal learning devices. Students are guided by assessments, counseling, and educators to choose courses to result in being career and/or college-ready. The plan does not successfully incorporate the core educational assurance areas to create learning environments that will significantly improve learning and teaching. The Applicant does offer evidence that the district is planning and evaluating courses and programs to guarantee that curriculum are aligned with college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements. The use of e-portfolios is an excellent idea to track students. Additionally, using current assessment tools like the ACT Plan and ACT Explore offer career/interest tools to students, educators, and families. Applicant does not offer convincing evidence that the district proposal will increase student achievement and deepen student learning or meet the academic needs of each student. Applicant, also, does not offer clear evidence and plans to increase the effectiveness of educators, expand student access to the most effective educators, decrease achievement gaps across student groups, and increase the rates at which students graduate from high school prepared for college and careers.

The Applicant does not meet Absolute Priority 1.

Total	210	53
-------	-----	----